

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 13-26, 28, and 32-34 remain under consideration. Claims 27, 29-31, 35 have been withdrawn from consideration.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth below.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claims 24 and 26 due to informalities. In particular, the Examiner pointed out that a number of limitations are only identifiable by the reference numbers, which are parenthetically added. By way of the present amendment, Applicants have specified these elements using different names such as “first,” “second,” “third,” etc., to separately identify these terms. Accordingly, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 13, 21-26, 28 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner points out a number of instances of insufficient antecedent basis in the claims. By way of the present amendment, Applicants have reviewed these claims and have

appropriately replaced “the” with “a” or “an.” Applicants have also corrected a number of other minor errors in the process. In view of this, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13 –22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,881,148 (Lambropoulos et al.) . This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner stated that the Lambropoulos et al. reference shows a locking device for electrically locking an automobile which controls the operation of the motor and the antitheft system working together using an electrical device (A) for encoding and a locking electrical circuit (R). Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s interpretation of the reference and its application to the claims. The Lambropoulos et al. reference does show a locking device for electrically locking an automobile using the now familiar remote control system whereby the user can lock or unlock the door or open the trunk remotely using a coded signal. However, Applicants submit that this system does not provide for the other functions discussed in the claims.

Thus, the present invention utilizes an encoder device 5 to activate a microcontroller or electrical system. This acts to operate motor 9 for unlocking a lock, which engages the brake clutch and/or acceleration pedal. At the same time, the electrical system or microcontroller produces an output 11, which also controls the anti-theft system. Thus, this anti-theft system can be a burglar alarm or other type of system, which is separate from the locking mechanism for the pedals.

The Examiner has stated that the reference shows an electrical system for controlling the operation of the motor and the anti-theft system working together with a locking device. However, Applicants see no interaction between the remote control door locks and any other anti-theft system. It is noted that the Examiner has not correlated this anti-theft system with any part of the Lambropoulos et al. system or given any indication as to where in the specification this is described. Applicants submit that this reference does not show this feature in any manner and that this relates to the an important arrangement of the overall system. If the Examiner persists in this rejection, he is requested to point out where in the specification this is shown.

Furthermore, it is noted that the device is described in the preamble as a locking device for electrically locking the brake, clutch and/or acceleration pedal of an automobile. The Lambropoulos et al. reference is designed specifically for locking and unlocking doors and the trunk. Applicants submit that there is no discussion of locking the brake, clutch or acceleration pedal. This limitation is not only found in the preamble, but is also specifically described in the first paragraph of the claim which discusses that the motor rotates to force the locking mechanism to operate and move the locking member “to lock the brake, clutch, and/or acceleration pedal of the automobile.” It is also described in the next-to-the-last paragraph, which relates specifically to the locking mechanism. Applicants submit that the reference does not in any manner describe this feature either. In view of this, Applicants submit that Claim 13 also defines over the Lambropoulos et al. reference for this reason.

Applicants furthermore submit that Claim 13 would not be obvious over the Lambropoulos et al. reference. There is no teaching in the reference of the use of this type of a

locking mechanism. Furthermore, even if it would be obvious to utilize this different type of locking mechanism, there still would be no teaching of the combination of the system controlling both the anti-theft system and the locking mechanism. Applicants note that the Chantrasuwan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,894) reference shows a locking device of the same general type. Even if this reference were combined with the Lambropoulos et al. reference, there still would be no teaching of controlling the anti-theft system working together with a locking device. Furthermore, it is not clear how it would be obvious to use the control mechanism of Lambropoulos et al. in the Chantrasuwan et al. system. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 13 would not be obvious over any of these references even if combined.

Claims 14-26, 28 and 32-34 depend from Claim 13 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of the claims recites other features, which make them additionally allowable.

For example, Claim 17 recites a resetting device to reset the anti-theft system. The Examiner has pointed out a resetting decoder 812. However, this device does not cancel the anti-theft system as in the present application, but instead merely resets the counter of the encoding device. In regard to Claim 18, the claim describes the encasing of the wired connection between the electrical circuit and the motor. Applicants submit that the reference does not show this feature. Claim 21 describes the electrical circuit as being installed inside a cavity of a metal cylinder. Applicants submit that the reference does not show this feature either. Claim 22 describes the installation of the locking device on the cylinder covering and steering well shaft. This is also not shown in the reference. Likewise, Claim 23 describes a metal cylinder encasing

the electrical circuit, which is also not shown in the reference. Claims 24-26 further describe in great detail the arrangement of the parts of the locking system, which is not seen in the reference. Claim 28 describes the arrangement of the master lock in regard to the locking system. This is also not shown in the reference. Claim 32 describes the encasing of the wired connection between the circuit and the motor as discussed above. Claim 34 describes the installation of the electrical circuit in a cavity of the metal cylinder, as also discussed above. Accordingly, these claims are also considered to be allowable.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Lambropoulos et al. in view of Chantrasuwan et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner points out that the Chantrasuwan et al. teaches a number of the mechanical features missing from Lambropoulos et al. However, Applicants submit that even these two references are combined, there still is no teaching of the use of an anti-theft system used with a locking device. Also, there is no teaching of the obviousness of using an electrical encoded signal to control a mechanical lock. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are also allowable.

The Examiner rejected Claims 26 and 28 as being obvious over Lambropoulos et al. in view of Dawson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,265,452). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner cites the Dawson reference to teach a gearing arrangement for a lock mechanism. However, even if this reference does show these features, Applicants submit that it

does not aid the Lambropoulos et al. reference in overcoming its deficiencies noted above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are likewise allowable.

It is noted that the Examiner has included Claims 23 and 32-34 in the rejected claims on the Office Action summary. However, these claims have not been rejected over prior art. Applicants agree with the Examiner that these claims define over the prior art. Of these claims, only Claims 23 and 34 have been included in the indefiniteness rejection. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 32 and 33 are accordingly allowable and should be indicated as such.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection, allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) respectfully petition(s) for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$510.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

